

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1 and 2. This sheet, which includes Figs. 1 and 2, replaces the original sheeting including Figs. 1 and 2. Figs. 1 and 2 are both labeled as Prior Art. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this amendment, claims 1-18 are pending. No claims are currently amended.

The drawings stand objected to because Figs. 1 and 2 omit the designation "Prior Art".
Figs. 1 and 2 are hereby amended to include a legend of "Prior Art". Withdrawal of the
objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinoshita
(US 6,314,607) in view of Stevens (US 4,864,678).

Kinoshita discloses a wiper with a quadric linking mechanism comprising a main lever or
drive lever and a sublever or control lever. Kinoshita fails to disclose that the levers are executed
to be elastic essentially perpendicular to the wiper plane to effect a pressure force from the wiper
arm on the windshield.

Stevens discloses a windshield wiper with a wiper arm that is directly connected to a
rotary driving spindle and is designed to effect a pressure force on the windshield.

The combination of Kinoshita and Stevens does not teach or suggest each and every
element of claim 1 to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Kinoshita does not mention effecting a
pressure force on the windshield at all. Consequently, a person of ordinary skill in the art would
have had no reason to incorporate teachings related to the exertion of force into the teachings of
Kinoshita. Even if that person of ordinary skill in the art wanted to increase or otherwise modify
the force effected from the wiper arm of Kinoshita on the windshield, and would therefore have
sought inspiration in Stevens, it would have been natural to incorporate the wiper arm described
by Stevens into the wiper system of Kinoshita. A combination of the teachings of Kinoshita and
Stevens would therefore have resulted in a wiper system comprising a quadric linking
mechanism with two levers and an elastic wiper arm that is elastic perpendicular to the wiper
plane to effect a pressure force on the windshield.

There would have been absolutely no motivation, however, to modify the wiper system
of Kinoshita such that one of the levers connected to the wiper arm is executed to be elastic to
effect a pressure force form the wiper arm on the windshield. Neither Kinoshita nor Stevens
provide any hint to such a modification. Such a modification is based upon impermissible
hindsight.

Kinoshita and Stevens, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Kinoshita and Stevens. Claims 2-18 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for the same and other reasons not specifically set forth herein.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-18 is respectfully requested. If additional consultation will further prosecution, the undersigned is available during normal business hours at the below-identified telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Julianne M. Cozad Smith
Reg. No. 62,174

Docket No.: 022862-1066
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560